International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 2015, 7 (3), 128 - 134

iojes
www.iojes.net

International Online Journal of Educational Sciences

ISSN: 1309-2707

Value Orientations of Students in Physical Education and Sports Departments at Various Universities*

Ümran Yahşi[1] and Oğuz Özbek[2]

[1]Ministry of Youth and Sports, Ankara, Turkey; [2]Ankara University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Ankara, Turkey.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 19.11.2014
Received in revised form 31.05.2015
Accepted 12.06.2015
Available online 12.07.2015

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research was to determine the opinions of the students in relation to the orientations of value at the School of Physical Education and Sports at Ankara University, Gazi University, and Hacettepe University in Ankara (Turkey). The research is a survey method. Scale is used as a tool of data collection. The tool of data collection was applied to 625 students in total, including 175 students in the School of Physical Education and Sports (SPES) at Ankara University, 265 students in the School of Physical Education and Sports (SPES) at Gazi University, 185 students in the School of Sports Sciences and Technology (SSST) at Hacettepe University. In order to examine whether the value orientations are different or not in terms of gender, independent t-test has been used, while and opinions on the schools and classes have been tested by One-Way Anavo test. LSD test has been used to test the differences among the groups. The first three most important values are seen to be being successful, being virtuous and being smart. However, the three values, which have the least importance, have been determined as being rich, living an exciting life and kindness. It has been found that male students attach more importance to dimension of stimulation than the female students, and that students in the SPES at Ankara University attach more importance to dimension of self-direction than students in the SSST at Hacettepe University and students in the SPES at Gazi University.

© 2015 IOJES. All rights reserved

Keywords:
Values, value orientations, physical education and sports students.

Introduction

Developments in the domains of science and technology have led to changes in people's value judgements and in priorities of their values. Changes experienced in the values can also affect the social life. Research has been done on values which provides practical information for those working in the social field (Wojciszke, 1989). A value is something about belief which can be desired or cannot be desired" (Gungor, 2000). Values are beliefs which are both desired or undesired or considered instinctual (Feather, 1995).Values play a major role in directing people's attitudes and behaviors as well (Gurkan et al., 2000). According to Aydın (2001) who quotes from Lamberton and Minor, a value -which is important for individuals- can be defined as any kind of mindset, object or event. Values -which are not innate- are cognitive structures that are learned subsequently in the society where an individual was born and grew up through the interpersonal interactions (Demirutku, 2007). Value is a process which is transmitted through the language and culture and occurs in complex human interactions generation after generation (Thomas, 2000). Each individual has countless values with different levels of importance (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003). Community people grew up in and their education affect their value preferences (Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987). These values guide for the evaluation of behavior and events by profoundly affecting the human life (Kilby, 1993;

*This article was presented at the 11th International Congress of Sports Sciences, November 10-12, 2010, Antalya, Turkey.

[2] Corresponding author's address: Ankara University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Ankara, Turkey.
Telephone: 0312 223 31 63
Fax: 0312 212 29 86
e-mail: oozbek@sports.ankara.edu.tr
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2015.03.011

© 2015 International Online Journal of Educational Sciences (IOJES) is a publication of Educational Researches and Publications Association (ERPA)

Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987), and enable us to explain and understand individuals' attitudes and behaviors (Basaran, 1993).

Schwartz (1992) and Rokeach (1973) have been pioneers in the studies of values. Rokeach in his study of values (1973) uses a list consisting of values of aim and intermediary. He classified the values as purposive and intermediary values. Purposive values -- the acquisitions of which are viewed as desirable-- are related to the fundamental life targets. However, intermediary values are related to behavioral patterns that play a role in achieving the fundamental values (Rokeach, 1973). Schwartz (1992) formed a new list consisting of ten sub-dimensions by developing Rokeach's list of values including Power, Achievement, Hedonism, Stimulation, Self-direction, Universalism, Benevolence, Traditionality, Conformity and Security (1973). Many studies have been made by using of the list of values of Schwartz (1992) and Rokeach (1973) (Cileli & Tezer, 1998; Kusdil & Kagıtcıbası, 2000; Pascual, 2009; Imamoglu & Aygun, 1999). Social values are transmitted to the next generation by means of education. Educational institutions and educators play an important role in value transmission (Altun, 2003). Many studies have been made about examining of pre-service teachers' (Yapıcı, Kutlu & Bilican, 2012; Oguz, 2012; Pascual, 2009), university students' (Lindeman & Verkasalo, 2005; Bacanlı, 1999; Cileli, 1998), school administrators' (Fırat, 2010) and teachers' (Kusdil & Kagıtcıbası, 2000; Aktepe & Yel, 2009) value opinions.

The preferences of value should be examined in order to adapt to the new regulations that have risen from the socio-economic structure by of the students in the School of Physical Education and Sports. Determining the value orientations of the students in the School of Physical Education and Sports who are trained in educational institutions of sports is important for their professional lives in terms of their adaptation to social changes and their being as values carriers. The main aim of this study is to examine the opinions of value orientations of the students trained in the School of the Physical Education and Sports.

Method

Survey method was used in the study. The research population includes the students at the Departments of Physical Education and Sports at various universities in Ankara: the School of Physical Education and Sports at Ankara University (SPES), the School of Physical Education and Sports at Gazi University (SPES), and the School of Sport Sciences and Technology (SSST) at Hacettepe University. The tool of data collection was applied to 625 students in total including 175 students in the SPES at Ankara University, 265 students in the SPES at Gazi University, 185 students in the SSST at Hacettepe University.

The Turkish adaptation of Schwartz's (1992) list of values (Kusdil and Kagıtcıbası 2000) Schwartz's list of values (1992) consists of ten sub-dimensions including Power, Achievement, Hedonism, Stimulation, Self-direction, Universalism, Benevolence, Traditionality, Conformity and Security. The sub-dimensions of the reliability coefficients of the scale -which was adapted by Kusdil and Kagıtcıbası (2000)- vary between the ranges of .78 and .83. In the study, Cronbach's Apha has been determined as .96 for the total scale; however the security coefficient determined changes between the ranges of .63 by .86 for the sub-dimensions. 4 items related to the personal data and 56 items related to the values were taken place in the scale and grading scale of Septet Likert type was used. The data has been analyzed by the frequency, percentage and mean. The value orientations of students were tested by the to find out whether they are different or not in terms of gender, but opinions on schools and classrooms were tested by One-Way Anova Test. LSD test was used to test the difference between groups.

Results

When the distribution of participant students were analyzed in terms of gender, it has been found that 258 of the students are female (41.3%), and 367 are male (58.7%). When the students were analyzed in terms of the school they trained in, it has been determined that 185 of the students in the SSST are at Hacettepe University (29.6%), 265 are at Gazi University (42.4%), 175 are at Ankara University (28%). When the students were analyzed according to the distributions of departments, it has been determined that 190 of the students are at the Department of Coaching Education (30.4%), 231 are at the Physical Education and Sports School Teaching (37%), 141 are at the Sports Management Department, 63 at the Department of Recreation (11.7%). When the students were analyzed according to the classes, it has been found that 156 of them are first-year (25%), 166 are second-year (26.6%), 175 are third-year (28%), 128 are fourth-year (20.5%) students.

Table 1. Opinions of the students on the dimensions and order of importance

Dimensions	Reliability Coefficient	Mean	Order of Importance
Power	.865	5.39	9
Achievement	.859	5.78	1
Hedonism	.807	5.52	7
Stimulation	.752	5.24	10
Self-direction	.836	5.72	2
Universalism	.825	5.53	6
Benevolence	.844	5.63	5
Traditionality	.681	5.49	8
Conformity	.638	5.64	4
Security	.713	5.67	3

The first three values determined by the students who participated in the study are: being successful (mean=6.03), being virtuous (mean =6.00) and being smart (mean =5.99). However, the three values - which have the least importance - have been determined as being rich (mean =4.80), living variables life (mean =4.85) and politeness (mean =5.10). On the other hand, it has been found out that the highest three grades for the dimensions of value are achievement (mean =5.78), self-direction (mean =5.72) and security (mean =5.67). The students in the SPES attach more importance to the dimensions of achievement, self-direction and security; however, they give lesser importance to the dimensions of stimulation, power and traditionality (Table 1).

Table 2. Results of the t test related to the dimensions of students' opinions according to gender variable

Dimensions	Gender	Mean	Order of Importance	s	t	p*
1. Power	F	26.70	9	5.62	.966	.334
	M	27.17	9	5.73		
2. Achievement	F	28.59	1	4.95	.130	.191
	M	29.12	1	5.03		
3. Hedonism	F	10.98	7	2.53	.536	.592
	M	11.09	6,5	2.44		
4. Stimulation	F	15.33	10	3.61	2.31	.021*
	M	16.01	10	3.62		
5.Self-direction	F	34.71	2	5.62	1.25	.209
	M	34.13	2	5.67		
6. Universalism	F	49.75	6	7.46	.222	.824
	M	49.89	6,5	8.25		
7. Benevolence	F	50.65	5	7.66	.053	.958
	M	50.68	5	8.15		
8. Traditionality	F	32.91	8	4.85	.191	.849
	M	32.99	8	5.33		
9. Conformity	F	22.58	4	3.42	.049	.961
	M	22.59	4	3.67		
10. Security	F	39.66	3	5.47	.168	.867
	M	39.74	3	5.45		

Df= 623 N_{Female}=258 N_{Male}=367 N_{Total}= 625 * p < .05

Table 2 shows that the order of importance given to the value dimensions by female and male students does not differ. Although dimensions of the value, which are rated as the most important by female and male students are achievement, self-direction and security; the dimensions of the value which have the least importance for them are hedonism, power and traditionality. When the students' opinions on the value orientations were analyzed in terms of their gender, a significant difference has been detected only for the dimension of stimulation from ten sub-dimensions. As is seen in Table 2, the average responses of the female students have been carried out at the level of (mean =15.33); however, the average responses of the male students have been carried out at the level of (mean =16.01). A significant difference has been determined as [t(623)=2.31, p<.05] between the male and female students' opinions. The level of importance which has been

attached by male students to the values enshrined in the stimulation dimension has been higher than female students.

Value orientations based on the school, a difference only on dimension of "self-direction" opinions have been detected between opinions of the students in the SPES; however, significant difference in other dimensions have not been observed. According to Table 3, the average opinion of the students is found to be at the following levels: (mean =34.11) for the students in the SSST at Hacettepe University, (mean=33.92) for the students in the SPES at Gazi University, and (mean=35.34) for the students in the SPES at Ankara University. Significant difference as [F (2,624) = 3.67, p<.05] has been observed as a result of the one-way analysis of variance conducted between the opinions of students based on the school. According to the LSD test result, a test performed to examine the differences, the SPES students at Ankara University attached more importance to the values enshrined in a self-direction dimension at a higher rate than the SSST students at Hacettepe University and the SPES students at Gazi University.

Table 3. Results of the average and variance analysis related to the Dimensions of students' opinions according to the school variable

Dimensions	University (mean)			F	p*	Difference (LSD)
	Hacettepe (1)	Gazi (2)	Ankara (3)			
1. Power	27.16	26.56	27.44	1.38	.251	-
2. Achievement	28.56	29.11	28.96	.676	.509	-
3.Hedonism	11.05	10.88	11.28	1.39	.249	-
4. Stimulation	16.15	15.60	15.48	1.81	.164	-
5. Self-direction	34.11	33.92	35.34	3.67	.026*	3 >1,2
6. Universalism	49.59	49.98	49.88	.133	.875	-
7. Benevolence	50.22	50.44	51.49	1.34	.261	-
8. Traditionality	32.58	33.18	33.02	.756	.470	-
9. Conformity	22.53	22.55	22.72	.153	.858	-
10. Security	39.34	39.80	39.95	.641	.527	-

$N_{Hacettepe}$=185 N_{Gazi}=265 N_{Ankara}=175 N_{Total}=625 *p <.05
Degree of freedom (Between Group =2, Within Group =622, Total=624)

Value orientations based on the class, a difference only on dimension of universalism, traditionality and security has been observed between opinions of the students of SPES; however no significant difference in other dimensions has been detected. According to Table 4, the average opinion of the students is found to be as follows: (mean=50.03) for the first-grade students, (mean=50.74) for the second-grade students, (mean=48.39) for the third-grade students, and (mean=50.40) for the fourth-grade students. There were significant differences - [F(3,621)=1.44, p<.05] - as a result of the one-way analysis of variance conducted between opinions of students based on the class. According to the LSD test result, it has been decided that the third-grade students attached more importance to the values in the dimension of the universalism at a higher rate than the second and fourth-grade students.

The average opinions of the students are: (mean=33.42) for the first-grade students, (mean=33.52) for the second-grade students (mean =32.11) for the third-grade students, as, and (mean =32.82) for the fourth-grade students as with regard to the dimension of traditionality. A significant difference was seen as [F (3,621) = 2.71, p<.05] as a result of the one-way analysis of variance performed between the opinions of students based on the class. According to the LSD test result, it has been arranged that the third-grade students attach more importance to the values enshrined in the dimension of traditionality at a higher rate than the first and second-grade students.

The average opinions of the first-grade students have been found out as (mean=39.26), the average opinions of the second-grade students as (mean=40.96), the average opinions of third-grade students as (mean=39.04), and the average opinions of the fourth-grade students as (mean =39.52) regarding the dimension of security. A significant difference has been seen as [F(3,621)=4.26, p<.05] between the opinions of students based on the class. According to the LSD test result, it has been determined that the second-grade students attach more importance to the values enshrined in the dimension of security at a higher rate than the students of other three classes.

Table 4. Results of the average and variance analysis related to the dimensions of students' opinions according to the class variable

Dimensions	Classroom (mean)				F	p*	Difference (LSD)
	1	2	3	4			
1. Power	26.91	27.06	26.74	27.31	.266	.850	-
2.Achievement	29.05	29.00	28.55	29.10	.416	.742	-
3.Hedonism	11.19	11.13	10.74	11.17	1.24	.293	-
4.Stimulation	15.66	15.43	15.64	16.31	1.49	.214	-
5.Self-direction	33.63	34.81	34.33	34.77	1.44	.230	-
6. Universalism	50.03	50.74	48.39	50.40	2.93	.033*	3>2,4
7. Benevolence	50.72	51.57	49.76	50.68	1.48	.218	-
8.Traditionality	33.42	33.52	32.11	32.82	2.71	.044*	3>1,2
9. Conformity	22.25	22.85	22.41	22.92	1.29	.275	-
10.Security	39.26	40.96	39.04	39.52	4.26	.005*	2>1,3,4

N_1=156 N_2=166 N_3=175 N_4=128 N_{Total}=625 *p <.05
Degree of freedom (Between Group =3, Within Group =621, Total=624)

Discussion

According to the findings obtained in the study, the first three values deemed significant by the students at the SPES are: being successful, being virtuous and being smart, respectively. However, the least important values revealed in the study are being rich, living an exciting life and kindness.

It has been observed that dimensions of achievement, self-direction and security, respectively, have the highest score, however dimensions of the stimulation, power and traditionality values have the lowest score. Students in the SPES consider achievement, self-direction and security more important; however, they care less about stimulation, power and traditionality. It pointed that self-direction is one of the most important value that supports research findings of Bacanlı (1999), Pascual (2009) and Fırat (2010).

In terms of gender, a significant difference was found in the dimension of stimulation value. The levels of participation of male students to the dimension of stimulation have been higher than that of the female students. Bulut (2012) states that the orientations of stimulation of the male students are higher than the orientations of stimulation of the female students, a finding which supports the research results. Other studies (Cileli & Tezer, 1998; Aydın, 2003; Lindeman & Verkasalo, 2005; Karaca, 2008, Dilmac et al., 2009) conclude that there are differences between gender and value orientations.

The students in the SPES at Ankara University attach more importance to the values of self-direction dimension at a higher rate than the students in the SSST at Hacettepe University and the students SPES at Gazi University. A study conducted by Yapıcı et al. (2012) reveals that importance of self-direction dimension was increased by the students at computer teaching department than students at other departments, which justifies the findings of the present study.

It has been concluded that the third-grade students attach more importance to the values of universality dimension at a higher rate than the second-grade and fourth-grade students. The third-grade students are observed to consider the values of universality dimension at a higher rate than second-grade and fourth-grade students. The students of third-grade attach more importance to the values of traditionality dimension at a higher rate than the first-grade and second grade students. The second-grade students attach more importance to the values which are enshrined in the security dimension than the other three classes. As a result of the similar studies, it has been decided that there are differences between the value orientations (Dilmac, et al., 2008; Karaca, 2008; Dilmac et al., 2009).

The order of importance attached to the dimensions of value given by the female and male students is found to be not different. The most important dimensions of value are found to be achievement, self-direction, and security; however, the least important dimensions of value are stimulation, power and traditionality for the female and male students. Finding -which enshrined in the study of Lindeman and Verkasalo (2005)- related to the dimension of self-direction supports the finding of this study. It has been observed that priority of values changes in terms of gender, school and class for the students in the SPES.

The outcomes of this study are supported by the results of similar studies, which helped us to determine the priority of values of the SPES students.

References

Altun, A. S. (2003). Eğitim yönetimi ve değerler [Educational management and values]. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1(1), 7-18.

Aydın, P.İ. (2001). *Yönetsel mesleki ve örgütsel etik [Managerial professional and organizational ethics].* Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.

Aydın, M. (2003). Gençliğin değer algısı: Konya örneği [Youth perception of value: Konya example]. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi,* 1(3), 121-144.

Aktepe, V. & S, Yel. (2009). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin değer yargılarının betimlenmesi: Kırşehir ili örneği [Descriptions of primary teachers' value judgment: Kırşehir example]. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(3), 607-622.

Bacanlı, H. (1999). Üniversite öğrencilerinin değer tercihleri [University students' value preferences]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi.* 20, 597-609.

Basaran, F. (1993). Üniversite eğitim süresi içinde öğrencilerin değer tercih sıralamalarında değişme [University students' value preferences in training period change in rank]. *VII. Ulusal Psikoloji Kongresi Bilimsel Çalışmaları*. Ankara: VII. Ulusal Psikoloji Kongresi Düzenleme Kurulu ve Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayını. 49-57.

Bardi, A. & Schwartz, H.S. (2003). Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin.* 29, 1207-1220.

Bulut, S. S. (2012). Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi öğrencilerinin değer yönelimleri [Gazi Faculty of Education students' value orientation]. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi,* (3) 216-238.

Cileli, M. & Tezer, E. (1998). Life and value orientations of Turkish university students, *Academic Search Premier*, *Adolessence*, 33(129), 219-224.

Demirutku, K. (2007). *Çocuk yetiştirme tarzları, değerlerin içselleştirilmesi ve benlik kavramı [Parenting styles, internalization of values, and the self-concept].* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ankara: Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi.

Dilmac, B., Bozgeyikli, H., & Cıkılı, Y. (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının değer algılarının farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Teachers' candidates of value perceptions to be examined in terms of different variables]. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 6(16), 65-92.

Dilmac, B., Deniz, M. & Deniz, E. M. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerinin öz-anlayışları ile değer tercihlerinin incelenmesi [University students' self-understanding through the examination of value preferences]. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 7(18), 9-24.

Esmer, Y. (2008). Islam, gender, democracy and values: The case of Turkey, 1990–2001. In T. Pettersson and Y. R. Esmer (Eds.), *Changing values, persisting cultures: Case studies in value change* (pp.275–301). Leiden: Brill.

Feather, N.T. (1995). Values, valences, and choice: the ınfluence of values on the perceived attractiveness and choice of alternatives. *Journal Personality and Social Psychology.* 68(6) 1135-1151.

Fırat, S. N. (2010). Okul müdürü ve öğretmenlerin okul kültürü ile değer sistemlerine ilişkin algıları [School principals and teachers' perceptions related to school culture and value system]. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 35(156), 71-83.

Gungor, E. (2000). *Değerler psikolojisi [Values psychology].* Istanbul: Ötüken Neşriyat A.Ş.

Gurkan, H., Camlıyer, H. & Saracaloglu, A.S. (2000). Beden eğitimi öğretmeni adaylarının değer sistemi [The value systems of prospective physical education teachers]. *Gazi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1, 35-52.

Imamoglu, E.O. & Aygun, Z. K. (1999). 1970'lerden 1990'lara değerler; üniversite düzeyinde gözlenen zaman, kuşak ve cinsiyet farklılıkları [Value preferences from 1970s to 1990s: Cohort, generation and gender differences at a Turkish university], *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi.* 14(44), 1-18.

Karaca, R. (2008). *İlahiyat fakültesi öğrencilerinin değer yönelimleri [Value orientations of students of the faculty of theology].* Unpublished master thesis. İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Kusdil, M.E. & Kagıtcıbası, Ç. (2000). Türk öğretmenlerin değer yönelimleri ve Shwartz değer kuramı *[*Value orientations of turkish teachers and schwartz's theory of values*]. Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 15(45), 59-76.

Kilby, W.R. (1993). *The study of human values.* USA: University Press of America.

Lindeman, M. & Verkasalo, M. (2005). Measuring values with the short Schwartz's value survey. *Journal of Persanonality Assesment*, 85(2), 170-178.

Oguz, E. (2012). Views of pre-service teachers on values and value education. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice* – 12 (2) [Supplementary Special Issue], 1320-1325.

Pascual, C.A.M.P. (2009). The work values of teacher training students in a Spanish university. Symbiosis between Schwartz and xing of work (mow) study group, *European Journal of Education*, 44(3), 441-451.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*, New York: The Free Press.

Schwartz, H.S. (1992). Universal in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances and empirical test in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. 25, 1-65.

Schwartz, H.S. & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a universal psychological structure of human values. *Journal Personality and Social Psychology*. 53(3), 550-562.

Thomas, E. (2000). Researching values in cross-cultural contexts. In R. Gardner, J. Cairns & D. Lawton (Eds.), *Education for values: Morals, ethics and citizenship in contemporary teaching* (pp.256–272). London: Kogan Page Limited.

Ural, A. & Kılıc, I. (2006). *Bilimsel araştırma süreci ve SPSS ile veri analizi [*Scientific research process and data analysis with SPSS*]*. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Yapıcı, A., Kutlu, M.O. & Bilican, F. I. (2012). Öğretmen adaylarının değer yönelimleri [Value orientations of teacher candidates]. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi,* 11(42), 129-151.

Wojciszke, B. (1989). The system of personal values and behaviour. In N. Eisenberg, J. Reykowski, & E. Staub (Eds.), *Social and moral values: Individual and societal perspectives,* (pp.229–251). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Puplisher.